DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 272 CS 506 138

AUTHOR Geddes, Doreen S.
TITLE Cross-Disciplinary Dialogue on the Effects of Gender Stereotypical Speech Style in a Management Setting.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (79th, Baltimore, MD, April 17-May 1, 1988). For a related document, see ED 284 317.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Employer Employee Relationship; Females; Interpersonal Communication; *Language Styles; Males; Organizational Communication; Sex Bias; *Sex Stereotypes; Speech Communication; Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior; Communication Patterns; *Communication Styles

ABSTRACT

To determine the most effective communication style for women in management, a study examined which of three power/gender speech strategies--stereotypical feminine (powerless), stereotypical masculine (powerful), and mixed stereotypical masculine/stereotypical feminine--was perceived most effective for a male or female when communicating with a subordinate about a problem. Subjects, 87 predominantly male union workers attending a summer seminar at Pennsylvania State University, watched a videotape of a scripted phone conversation of actors representing male and female managers using each of the three speech strategies. Results revealed that the mixed gender strategy (balancing the masculine task-oriented style with the feminine relationship-oriented style) was preferred by both female and male respondents. Respondents also rated male and female managers similarly on overall effectiveness, suggesting that stereotypes lose salience as a means for evaluating when other information is available to the rater, and that the traditional notions of successful management--equated with males and masculinity--may be changing. (One table of data is included, and 6 pages of references are appended.) (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294272

Cross-Disciplinary Dialogue on the Effects of Gender Stereotypical Speech Style in a Management Setting

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Doreen S. Geddes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Doreen S. Geddes
Western Kentucky University

Eastern Communication Association
Annual Convention
April, 1988

CS506 38

WKU—Printing paid from state funds. KRS 57.375

BEST COPY AVAILA

The number of women entering management positions has steadily increased. In 1970 only 15.9% of executives, managers or administrators were women (Employment & Training Report of the President, 1982). In contrast, in 1986 38.5% of these positions were held by women (Employment and Earnings, U.S. Department of Labor, 1987).

Although greater numbers of women now occupy management positions, women are perceived as less effective than men in managerial roles (Bowman, Worthy, & Greyser 1965, Baron, 1982, Sculnick, 1986). However, empirical studies suggest leadership behaviors and abilities are similar for male and female managers (Powell & Butterfield, 1982, Day & Stogdill, 1972, Bartol & Butterfield, 1976, Donnell & Hall, 1980). Pearson (1985) suggests women may need to develop their own unique style of managerial behavior.

In order to discover leadership strategies to enhance the perception of women as managers, it is necessary to examine a variety of leadership behaviors. The managerial behavior of interest to this investigation is communication. While communication skill has been shown to be essential for managerial success, little research has examined communication behavior for female managers (Wheeless & Berryman-Fink, 1985).

In examining successful communication strategies for women managers, it is necessary to borrow from related fields of knowledge to understand this particular communication event. To investigate effective communication styles for women in management, this study

incorporates research from management, social psychology as well as speech communication. Each of these fields makes important contributions to this investigation.

Research findings in management can reveal reactions to women as managers, actual managerial behaviors of male and female leaders, and perceptions of behaviors associated with effective leadership for men and women. In constructing communication strategies for women managers, it is essential to understand both perceived and actual behaviors associated with female leadership.

The broad field of social psychology can lend this study a wealth of literature on sex role expectations, actual and perceived behavioral differences between men and women, reactions to stereotypical behaviors, and relative ratings of males versus females. An understanding of how our society views men and women is important in investigating possible communication strategies for women managers.

Thus, both the management and social psychology disciplines can contribute to the study of effective communication strategies for female managers. In return, examination of communication style for women leaders can benefit these fields as well. First, management can benefit from an understanding of the effects of communication style on perceptions of leadership effectiveness for men and women. Since communication is an integral part of successful leadership, this information can make an important contribution do the knowledge base of management. Second, social psychology can benefit from communication research on actual and perceived communication styles for male and female managers. This

information can be included in social psychology's repository of knowledge on actual and perceived behavioral differences between men and women. Thus, each of these fields both gives and gains knowledge.

In order to develop strategies that will enhance the perception of women managers, it is necessary to cross the boundaries of these three disciplines. This cross-disciplinary dialogue contributes to advancing the role of women as managers.

A review of the management literature produces some enlightening findings regarding the perception of women as managers and characteristics associated with effective leadership. Effective leadership is associated with males and masculinity. For instance, Schein (1973, 1975) sampled middle-line male and female managers as to characteristics they associated with effective leadership. She found they perceive both successful managers and men to possess masculine characteristics such as leadership, competitiveness, self-confidence, objectivity, aggressiveness, and the like. Women were perceived as not possessing these characteristics.

Powell and Butterfield (1979, 1984, Powell, 1982) later replicated these findings. Using the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), they asked subjects to describe the characteristics of a "good" manager. The BSRI contains 20 items characteristic of the masculine sex-role stereotype (e.g., self-reliant, defends own beliefs, ambitious), 20 items characteristic of the feminine sex-role stereotype (e.g., sympathetic, yielding, shy), and 20 items not associated exclusively with either stereotype (e.g., helpful,

conscientious) (Powell and Butterfield, 1984). In all three studies Powell and Butterfield found the "good" manager was described in stereotypical masculine terms. In their 1984 study they additionally asked subjects to describe a "bad" manager. Interestingly, a "bad" manager was described as low in both femininity and masculinity. This finding was in contrast to their expectation that a "bad" manager would be described in stereotypical feminine terms.

Similarly, other researchers have also found traits associated with the male sex-role stereotype are perceived as crucial for success in managerial positions (Rosen & Jerdee, 1973; Brenner & Bromer, 1981; Steinberg & Shapiro, 1982).

Not only is effective leadership associated with masculine characteristics, but masculine characteristics are more highly valued in our society. Traditionally, characteristics such as self-reliance, independence, aggressiveness, and dominance were associated with men. Women were characterized as being sympathetic, sensitive to others, gentle, yielding (Eakins & Eakins, 1978). Broverman and his associates (1972) report that masculine characteristics have been more highly valued by our society than have been feminine characteristics. The work of Eakins & Eakins (1978) substantiates this view.

Just as masculine qualities are more highly valued than feminine qualities in our culture, so, too, are males more highly evaluated than equally qualified females. Bartol & Butterfield (1976) and Nieva & Gutek (1980) note a pro-male bias in most studies of effects of sex on evaluations. There is indication that this pro-male bias extends into the workplace. A number of

studies have found males are rated higher than equally qualified females for management positions (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974a; Dipboye, Arvey, & Terpstra, 1977; Heilman, 1984; Cash & Kilcullen, 1985).

Other studies suggest respondents descriminated against females in personnel decisions (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974b, 1974c; Rosen, Jerdee, & Pestwick, 1975; Gutek & Stevens, 1979; Wiley & Eskilson, 1983). In short, the management literature suggests males are preferred over equally qualified females in management positions & decisions.

Although effective leadership is associated with males and masculine characteristics, and women are seen as less suitable for managerial roles, research investigating actual behavior of male and female managers suggests males and females are similar in leadership ability and characteristics (Day & Stogdill, 1972; Donnell & Hall, 1980; Chapman, 1975; Begin, 1981; Boulgarides, 1984).

Since the management role has been culturally defined as a masculine role (Powell & Butterfield, 1984), it is not surprising that studies suggest women are seen as incongruous with management postitions. With masculinity as a standard for effective management it would seem that women aspiring to management should assume stereotypical behaviors. However, empirical evidence suggests that female managers using a typically masculine style may be viewed negatively. For instance, women managers using a masculine style were viewed as the least effective management

style combination (Haccoun, Sallay, & Haccoun, 1978). Similarly, Bradley (1980) found competent, masculine-behaving women generally are not well-liked by their peers.

For women aspiring to management, there exists a paradox. On the one hand, is the cultural assumption that females lack the necessary "masculine" qualities to succeed as managers. On the other hand, if women do exhibit these "masculine" qualities, then they may be perceived as unfeminine and emasculating.

In uncovering effective stategies for women leaders, it is important to consider the research that supports the notion that individuals use different criteria when evaluating male verus female leaders. For instance, Schein (1975) suggests that sex-role stereotypes influence perceptions of managerial style, so that the same behavior is perceived differently if it comes from a female rather than a male supervisor. Schein's (1975) sex-role congruency theory hypothesizes that leader behavior consistent with sex-role stereotypes should be more positively related to subordinate satisfaction than inconsistent behavior.

A considerable amount of research testing the sex-role congruency hypothesis for leaders suggests that managers are rated more favorably when their behaviors are congruent with sex-role stereotypes (Deux & Taynor, 1973; Rosen & Jerdee, 1973; Bartol & Butterfield, 1976; Garland & Price, 1976; Haccoun, Sallay, Haccoun, 1978; Wiley & Eskilson, 1982; Bradley, 1980; Olney, 1986; Jago & Vroom, 1982, Wexley & Pulakos, 1982).

Other studies, however, suggest female leaders are not evaluated or perceived differently from male leaders when

exhibiting the same behaviors (Day & Stogdill, 1972; Lee & Alvarez, 1977; Remland, Jacobson, & Jones, 1983; Osborn & Vicars, 1976; Petty & Bruning, 1980; Tsui & Gutek, 1984; Son & Schmitt, 1983; Arnett, Higgins, & Priem, 1980).

Petty and Bruning (1980) write that there are few clues for the inconsistent findings for the sex-role congruency hypothesis for leaders. They report that both laboratory and field studies have been used to investigate the hypothesis. Laboratory studies have generally supported the hypothesis. Terborg (1977) points out that stereotypes may be more operational in laboratory settings because the manipulated variable of sex may be one of the few bits of information that subjects can use to make a discrimination. In the absence of personal knowledge about the hypothetical leader, subjects in the laboratory setting may revert to the use of traditional sex-role stereotypes. Therefore, laboratory studies of the sex-role congruency hypothesis have been criticized because they lack external validity (Petty & Bruning, 1980). However, field studies of the hypothesis yield inconsistent results as well (Petty & Bruning, 1980). Therefore, one cannot predict with a high degree of probability that male and female managers will be rated similarly when using the same leadership behaviors.

Since a substantial part of the research findings indicate people expect leaders to behave according to sex role stereotypes, it is possible there is a connection between sex role expectations and communication style for male and female managers as well. The same communication behaviors that are perceived effective for

male managers may not be perceived effective for female managers. This study will investigate whether similar communication behaviors are evaluated differently when used by a male versus a female manager.

An understanding of the perceived effectiveness of communicaton for both male and female managers is essential in helping them succeed in leadership roles. It has been estimated that from 66 to 75 percent of a manager's time is spent in some form of interpersonal communication (Hyman, 1980). The success of a manager, therefore, can depend upon his or her communication effectiveness. However, few studies have specifically focused on communication behaviors for female managers (Wheeless & Berrryman-Fink, 1985).

As mentioned earlier, stereotypical masculine qualities have been associated with the perception of effective leadership (Schein, 1975; Powell, 1982). Since communication is one expression of sex-role behavior, it would seem to follow that a stereotypical masculine speech style would also be associated with effective leadership. However, even if the stereotypical masculine speech style were perceived as most effective for male managers, would it also be perceived as effective for female managers?

The gender communication literature has identitied specific behaviors associated with stereotypical masculine and stereotypical feminine speech styles (Thorne & Henley, 1977, Haas, 1979; O'Barr & Atkins, 1980). Stereotypical male and stereotypical female speech differ in form, topic, content, and use according to Haas (1979). The specific gender speech

variable of interest to this study is speech style. Research in gender communication suggests differences between traditional male and female speech styles (e.g., Haas, 1979, Siegler & Siegler, 1976; Price & Graves, 1980; Crosby & Nyquist, 1977; Newcombe & Arnkoff, 1979; Montgomery & Norton, 1981). By manipulating these behaviors it is possible to investigate the effects of the "pure" stereotypical gender speech styles as well as gender speech style combinations.

O'Barr & Atkins (1980) note that the features of female speech are not restricted to women but are associated with persons of low social power regardless of gender. They suggest renaming the female speech "powerless language" because of its link to high social power. They propose the renaming of the phenomena does not link it unneccessarily to the sex of the speaker, rather the label associates the speech with speaker's social status. Finally, they suggest that the tendency for women to use "powerless language" and men to use "powerful language" is reflective of the relative difference in their social positions in our society.

Although many powerful/stereotypical masculine and powerless/stereotypical feminine speech behaviors correspond with one another, some researchers label those speech attributes according to power, while other label them according to gender. This investigation was not concerned with the particular labels assigned to the speech styles, but rather, with the set of behaviors which these speech styles have in common.

Various communication situations elicit differing

communication strategies. It is not possible in a single study to explore all the possible organizational communication contexts which might confront a manager. Therefore, the scope of this investigation will be limited to a manager communicating with a subordinate about a problem.

Specifically, then, this study will investigate which of three power/gender speech strategies is perceived most effective for a male or a female manager to use when communicating with a subordinate about a problem. The speech strategies that will be examined are: (1) a stereotypical feminine (powerless) style, (2) a stereotypical masculine (powerful) style, and (3) a mixed stereotypical masculine (powerful)/stereotypical feminine (powerless) style.

Stereotypical feminine speech is described as tentative, unassertive, expressive, and responsive (Thorne & Henley, 1975; Lakoff, 1975; Zeldin, Small & Savin-Williams, 1982). For instance, hedges, qualifiers, fillers, desclaimers, tag questions (declarative statement ending with a question), and questioning intonation abound in traditional female speech. These speech forms indicate tentativeness and unassertiveness (Crosby, & Nyquist, 1977; Newcombe & Arnkoff, 1979; Warfel, 1984; Eakins & Eakins, 1978). Likewise, female speech is more expressive with a greater use of intensifiers and empty adjectives (Crosby & Nyquist, 1977, Lakoff, 1973). Female speech contains polite forms, apologies, and compound requests (softened requests) indicating a deference to or concern for the other person (Crosby & Nyquist, 1977; Newcombe & Arnkoff, 1979; Eakins & Eakins, 1978). Women's language emphasizes relationships and the

interpersonal dimensions of interaction (McMillan, et al. 1977).

In contrast, stereotypical masculine speech is described as direct, clear, and precise. Male speech is characterized by the absence of the message elements associated with female speech. Consequently, male speech tends to be briefer and more concise than female speech. Whereas female speech focuses on relationships, male speech deemphasizes the interpersonal and emotional dimensions of interaction. Male speech, instead, stresses the instrumental and rational dimensions (McMillan et al. 1977).

The concept of a mixed gender speech style has been heretofore unexplored. For the present study a mixed gender speech style was defined as a blend of the stereotypical male and stereotypical female speech styles. In the mixed style, part of the statements contain female speech style elements, while the remaining statements contain no female speech style elements and, therefore, represent a male speech style.

Although several studies have manipulated the use of powerless and powerful speech forms for males and females in various settings (Bradac & Mulac, 1984; Erickson, Lind, Johnson, & O'Barr, 1978; Warfel, 1984; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985; Wright & Hosman, 1983), none has manipulated these speech styles for managers. Furthermore, the studies investigating powerless and powerful speech forms have focused on these speaking attributes as polar extremes. None has examined a possible blend of these dichotomous styles. Therefore, the present study additionally examined a third possible speech style--a mixed speech style. The mixed speech style is intended to represent a

style midway between the powerful (stereotypical masculine) and the powerless (stereotypical feminine) speech styles and, thus, possesses aspects of both styles.

In order to create a real-life portrayal that provided subjects with cues about the communicator, the current study used a videotape format. Subjects are more likely to rely on stereotypes when little information is available about the targets according to Insko & Schopler (1972). Therefore, by having visual and aural communication cues, respondents should respond less according to stereotypes. Effectiveness of manager speech style was evaluated by respondents who viewed videotapes of a male or female manager using the three gender/power speech styles while communicating with a subordinate.

Specifically, then, this study investigated which of three power/gender speech strategies is perceived most effective for a male or a female manager to use when communicating with a subordinate about a problem. The speech strategies that were examined are: (1) a stereotypical feminine (powerless) style, (2) a stereotypical masculine (powerful) style, and (3) a mixed stereotypical masculine (powerful)/stereotypical feminine (powerless) style.

METHOD

Respondents

Respondents were 87 union workers attending a summer seminar at The Pennsylvania State University. Union workers, representing three unions or union collectives, were predominantly male (72.4%) and between the ages of 26-55 years old (88.5%). Most respondents (91.8%) had completed high school and many (50.5%) had taken college courses as

well. Respondents were predominantly white (92%) and earned over $20,000 annually (75.2%)

Most respondents had been at their present job for at least eleven years or more (70.1%). Nearly all of the respondents (83.9%) either currently, or in the past, held a leadership position within their union. When asked if they had ever worked for a woman manager, many respondents (56.3%) had not, but most (70.1%) had worked with or around a woman manager.

A union sample was selected as they are accustomed to working for managers and functioning in full-time jobs.

Speech Style Variable

Gender/power speech styles were operationalized as in previous studies of powerful and powerless speech (Bradac, Hemphill & Tardy, 1981; Bradac & Mulac, 1984; Erickson, Lind, Johnson, & O'Barr, 1978). A stereotypical feminine (powerless) speech style was characterized by the use of one of the following message elements in each of the speaker's statements:

1. Qualifiers: Phrases such as "kind of," "I guess," "maybe," "sort of" indicate the speaker lacks authority or conviction. Qualifiers also lessen the unkindness of a statement because of their tentativeness.

2. Tag questions: Phrases which turn a declarative statement into a question by tagging a question onto the end of a statement. Example: "That was an interesting lecture, don't you think?" Tags may be used when a speaker does not have full confidence in his/her statement. Tags can also be used to elicit a response from the other person.

3. Compound requests: Rather than making a simple request, the speaker softens the request with extra wording. For instance, "Drop that by my office," might become "You could drop that by my office, if you'd like." The wordier compound request softens the brusqueness of the former statement and appears more polite.

4. Polite forms: Polite forms indicate a deference to or consideration of the other person. Examples: "Thank you for your time." "Please call me later in the day."

5. Disclaimers: Express uncertainty. Eakins & Eakins (1978, p. 45) define disclaimers as "introductory expressions that excuse, explain, or request understanding or forbearance." Examples: "This may sound odd, but . . .," or "I could be wrong, but . . ."

6. Intensifiers: Increase or emphasize the force of a statement. Examples: "really," "very," "surely," "such."

7. Verbal fillers: Words or phrases that we use to fill in silences. Examples: "well," "okay," "you know."

A stereotypical masculine (powerful) speech style was characterized by the absence of the message elements identified for the powerless speech. As a result, all statements in a powerful speech style were devoid of qualifiers, tag questions, compound requests, intensifiers, polite forms, disclaimers, and verbal fillers.

A mixed speech style was characterized by the presence of the message elements for the powerless speech style in part of the speaker's statements. The remaining statements made by the speaker included no powerless speech elements and, thus, were characterized as powerful. The rationale for operationalizing mixed speech style in the manner described was to blend characteristics of both the stereotypical

masculine (powerful) and stereotypical feminine (powerless) speech styles. Since a mixed speech style has not been researched, it has not been operationalized previously.

Manager-Subordinate Communication Episode

A script was created which depicted a manager talking on the phone to a subordinate who has called with a work problem. The script contained only the manager's portion of the conversation so that respondents would focus solely on the manager's speech style. The script was devised such that the nature of the conversation was revealed by hearing only the manager's part of the dialogue.

In order to compare the effects of the three speech styles, this basic script was then modified by adding or deleting the speech elements characteristic of each style. The resulting three versions of the script were: (1) stereotypical masculine (powerful, (2) stereotypical feminine (powerless), (3) mixed gender/power speech styles. The message for each script was approximately one minute in length depending upon the version presented.

Two experienced actors were hired to enact the role of manager in the script. Both the male and female actors were videotaped encoding all three speech style scripts. The setting was constant for the actors for the three script versions. Both actors depicted the realistic age and appearance of a manager of blue-collar workers. Each was filmed seated behind a desk so that the body was visible only from the waist up.

Manipulation Check

In order to determine if naive subjects could distinguish among the three speech styles, a paired comparison scaled analysis was conducted. Fifty-five volunteers from four sections of basic public speaking courses at a major Northeastern university rated the possible pairs of gender/style combinations.

Analysis of the data from the preliminary paired comparison scaling study revealed that naive subjects could distinguish among the three speech styles. For both the male and female manager, the powerful style was rated most powerful/aggressive followed by the mixed style. The powerless style was rated least powerful/aggressive.

Measures

Respondents were asked to evaluate each speech style on a 5-point Likert-type scale for seven questions. Questions were based on Bartol and Butterfield's (1976) study which evaluated effectiveness of leadership styles. Wording was modified to reflect the differing management scenario used in the current study. Scores for the nine questions constituted the dependent variable. The questions asked were:

1. All in all, how effective do you think this manager's behavior is?
2. How effective do you think this manager would be in influencing upper management?
3. How effective do you think this manager would be in working with union leaders?
4. How satisfied do you think employees in your department would be if they were working for this manager?
5. How satisfied would you be working for this manager?

6. How productive do you think employees in your department would be if they were working for this manager?

7. How satisfied do you think the employees in this department are?

8. How do you think this manager's boss would rate the manager's behavior?

9. Based on what you saw, how much would you say you liked this version?

Respondents' evaluation of manager's gender/power speech style was determined by totalling the scores for the nine questions which constituted the dependent variable. The highest total score a manager's gender/power speech style could receive was 45 and the lowest was 9. This score was referred to as manager's gender/power speech style effectiveness score.

Procedures

Union seminar participants gathered as a whole and were told the study examined manager communication style. Those who volunteered to participate stayed, and the others left the room. The volunteers who remained were given a packet ot materials and a pencil. The packet included: informed consent/explanation of the study documents; a two-part booklet containing demographic questions in Part I and the nine questions measuring manager communication style repeated for each style in Part II; and a computer scan sheet.

Volunteer respondents received instructions, answered the demographic questions in Part I of the booklet, then were divided in two groups. Half the respondents saw and evaluated the videos of the male manager using all three gender/power speech styles.

In another location, the other half of the respondents saw the videos of the female manager using all three gender/power speech styles. Respondents evaluated each style by answering the questions in Part II of the booklet. After all respondents had turned in their packet of materials, they were debriefed.

Design and Analysis

The variables of primary interest in this study were speech style (stereotypical masculine/powerful, stereotypical feminine/powerless, or mixed gender/power); manager's sex, and respondent's sex. This describes a 3 x 2 x 2 factorial design.

Two-way analyses of variance were conducted examining the effects of the independent variables on the manager effectiveness scores. When significant main effects or interactions were obtained, post hoc Tukey's were utilized to examine differences among groups. The 0.05 level was set for all comparisons.

In-score reliability coefficients obtained for the effectiveness measures indicated a high degree of stability (alpha = .854).

RESULTS

Before analysis could be conducted, it was necessary to consider whether the sample could be treated as a unified sample. To determine the homogeneity of the three union samples, two-way analysis of variance was conducted on the three gender/power speech style variables and the two sex-of-manager variables. None of the tests conducted revealed a significant difference among the three unions in preference for sex of manager or

gender/power speech style. This strong unity among the unions suggested the three sub-samples could be treated as one unified sample.

In order to investigate sex-of-manager and speech style preferences of male and female respondents, two-way analysis of variance was performed. First, data from male respondents were analyzed; then data from female respondents were analyzed. For both analyses two-way analysis of variance was conducted on the three speech style variables and the two sex-of-manager variables. A summary of the gender/power speech style mean effectiveness scores for the male and female manager can be found in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Gender/Power Speech Style Mean Effectiveness Scores for the Male and Female Manager

	Gender/Power Speech Style					
	(Powerful) Masculine		(Powerless) Feminine		Mixed	
	Male Manager	Female Manager	Male Manager	Female Manager	Male Manager	Female Manager
Male Respondents (N = 63)	20.6	25.1	28.7	25.6	32.8	33.8
Female Respondents (N = 24)	23.3	25.9	29.7	23.0	36.7	35.6

*Higher scores indicate greater effectiveness

First, is a discussion of male respondents' preferences. Two-way analysis of variance revealed no significant main effect for sex of manager ($F = .757$, $p = .388$, $df = 1$). However, a main effect for speech style occurred ($F = 4.965$, $p = .0001$, $df = 2$) as

well as an interaction between sex of manager and speech style ($F = 4.965$, $p = .008$, $df = 2$).

To investigate the main effect for speech style a series of Tukey WSD T-tests were performed. For the pair-wise contrasts of the speech style means the critical value of T equals 2.38 at .05 level of significance, df = 122. Male respondents rated the mixed style significantly higher than the feminine style (obtained T = 5.346). The feminine style, in turn, was rated significantly higher than the masculine style (obtained T = 3.244).

To analyze the interaction between sex of manager and speech style, a second series of Tukey T-tests were conducted using pair-wise contrasts for both the male and female manager speech style effectiveness score means. The critical value of T equals 2.90 for .05 level of significance, df = 170. Of the fifteen possible pair-wise contrasts, male respondents rated the mixed style highest for both the male and female manager. Although the female mixed version was rated higher than the male mixed version, the difference was not significant (obtained T = .592).

Both the male and female using the mixed style were rated significantly higher when paired with any of the other sex-of-manager/speech style combinations. The one exception is when the male using the mixed style is compared to the male using a feminine style, there is no significant difference (obtained T = 2.285).

After the mixed style, the gender/power speech style with the next highest rating was the male manager using the feminine

speech style. Male respondents rated the male using the feminine style significantly higher than the male using the masculine style (obtained T = 4.503). The male using the feminine style was also rated higher than the female using the feminine style (obtained T = 1.840) and the female using the masculine style (obtained T = 2.139), but neither difference was significant.

Finally, the female manager using the masculine style and the female manager using the feminine style were rated similarly (obtained T = .317) by male respondents. Each of these styles was preferred over the male manager using the masculine style. The female manager using the feminine style was rated significantly higher than the male using the masculine style (obtained T = 2.907). The female using the masculine style was rated higher and the difference approaches significance when compared with the male using the masculine style (obtained T = 2.608).

Next, data from female respondents were analyzed using two-way analysis of variance on the three speech style variables and the two sex-of-manager variables. Although the male manager was rated slightly higher, there was no significant main effect for gender of manager ($F = .827$, $p = .373$, $df = 1$). However, two-way analysis of variance revealed a main effect for speech style ($F = 21.557$, $p = .0001$, $df = 2$).

To investigate the main effect for speech style, a series of Tukey WSD T-tests were performed. Two of the three pair-wise contrasts of the speech style score means exceeded the 2.42 critical value of T at the .05 level of significance, df = 44. Female respondents rated the mixed style significantly higher

than the masculine (obtained T = 6.158) or feminine styles (obtained T = 5.042). There was, however, no significant difference between the feminine and masculine speech styles (obtained T = 1.116). Since no significant sex-of-manager/speech style interaction was found (F = 3.015, p = .059, df = 2), no further analysis was conducted.

DISCUSSION

Two limitations must be noted before discussing the findings. First, any main effects or interactions involving manager gender must be viewed with caution. Since only one female and one male actor were used, responses may have been caused by actors' individual differences rather than by gender.

Second, the sample size (N = 87) restricted analyses performed. Serial manipulations using two-way analysis of variance were conducted rather than three-way multivariate analysis of variance due to the limited number in the sample. The sample size of female respondents was particularly small (N = 24) and, consequently, possessed minimal power for detecting first-order interactions.

Nevertheless, some significant findings emerged and bear noting. First, respondents rated the male and female manager similarly on overall effectiveness. This suggests as Insko and Schopler proposed (1972) that stereotypes lose salience as a means for evaluating when other information is available to the rater. More importantly, it may also suggest that gender of manager is becoming less an issue, at least among the union groups sampled.

Second, these findings indicate respondents had distinct manager gender/power speech style preferences. Both the male and female respondents clearly preferred the mixed speech style. That the mixed style emerged the favorite suggests that the speech style of managers needs to balance the masculine task-oriented style with the feminine relationship-oriented style.

That female respondents rated the masculine and feminine speech styles similarly is curious. Replication with a larger female sample may detect significant first-order interactions that account for this finding. Female respondents rated the female manager using the feminine style the lowest. However, they rated the male manager using the feminine style considerably higher. On the other hand, female respondents rated the male and female manager similarly for the masculine style. An interaction for sex-of-manager and feminine speech style may account for the apparent similarity in rating of the masculine and feminine styles.

In contrast, male respondents clearly preferred the feminine style over the masculine style. This unexpected finding may possibly be explained by the sensitization of union leaders to management style. The traditional masculine task-oriented autocratic management style may have contribuited to union-management adversarial relations. If this is the case, then this would explain why the masculine style would be viewed as least effective. On the other hand, the humanizing force of the feminine style would be seen as more employee-oriented and, thus, more effective.

This same logic would help to explain the sex-of-manager/speech style interaction preferences reported by male respondents. Although male respondents clearly preferred the mixed style for both male and female manager, the next preferred style was the male using a feminine style. The female using the feminine style was rated next highest but followed close behind by the female using the masculine style. The lack of significance between the latter two ratings could be accounted for because male respondents may view a female manager as contributing a humanizing influence regardless of her communication style. In other words, the harshness of the masculine style is offset by the fact she is a woman. If this is the case, it is not surprising that the male using the masculine style was least preferred.

The results of this study suggest that traditional notions of the ideal manager may be changing. Successful management was not equated with males and masculinity. In fact,a strong case can be made for the inclusion of stereotypical femalecommunication behavior in a model of effective leadership. Most surprisingly, thestereotypical masculine speech style was seen as the least effective style by the male respondents. The instrumental nature ofthe male speech may have been seen as showing little concern for theemployee. Moreover, malerespondents preferencefor the female speech style over the male speech style may indicate they regard the relationship-orientation of the female speech more highly than the task-orientation of the male speech.

Both male and female respondents viewed the mixed gender speech style as most effective. This finding reinforces Camden &

Witt's (1985) suggestion that effective management may require both female and male managers to develop and use both stereotypical feminine and masculine communication behaviors.

The preference for the mixed gender speech style can be explained in terms of contemporary models of effective leadership. Whereas, traditional models of leadership were characterized by task-oriented behavior, current thinking in management emphasizes both task-oriented and relationship-oriented dimensions. A blend of the task-oriented male speech with the relationship-oriented female speech exemplifies a communication style consistent with contemporary management theory.

Although the original purpose of this research was to investigate communication styles which would most benefit female managers, the findings indicate some powerful implications for male managers as well. Further research using various male and female manager stimuli would determine if present findings are restricted to the individual actor/managers used in the current study or if results can be generalized. In addition, the use of other sample work group populations would establish if results are limited to the union groups sampled here.

Through the cross-disciplinary dialogue among the fields of speech communication, management, and social psychology, this study has advanced our understanding of effective speech strategies for both male and female managers. Continued dialogue among these disciplines can, hopefully, produce a knowledge base that will assist women in their quest for managerial success.

Bibliography

Arnett, M.D., Higgins, R.B., Priem, A.P. "Sex and Least Preferred Co-Worker Score Effects In Leadership Behavior," Sex Roles, 6:1 (1980), 139-152.

Baird, J.E., Jr. and Bradley, P.H. (1979). Styles of management and communication: A comparative study of men and women. Communication Monographs, 46:2, 101-111.

Baron, A.S. "What Men Are Saying About Women in Business," Business Horizons, (January/February 1982), 10-14.

Bartol, K.M. and Butterfield, D.A. (1976). Sex effects in evaluating leaders. Journal of Speech Communication, 61, 446-454.

Begin, F.C. (1981). An analysis of the leadership style and motivational concerns of experienced government managers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 5-A.

Boulgarides, J.D. (1984). A comparison of male and female business managers. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 5.5, 27-31.

Bowman, G.W., Worth, N.B., and Greyser, S.A. "Are Women Executives People?" Harvard Business Review, 43 (1965), 14-16.

Bradac, J., Hemphill, M. and Tardy, C. (1981). Effects of 'powerful' & 'powerless' speech upon judgements of victims and villains. Western Journal of speech Communication, 45, 327-341.

Bradac, J.J. and Mulac, A. (1984). A molecular view of powerful and powerless speech styles: Attributional consequences of specific language features and communication intentions. Communication Monographs, 51, 307-319.

Bradley, P.H. (1980). Sex, competence, and opinion deviation: An expectation states approach. Communication Monographs, 47:2, 101-110.

Bradley, P.H. (1981). The folk-linguistics of women's speech: An empirical examination. Communication Monographs, 48, 73-90.

Brenner, O.C. and Bromer, J.A. (1981). Sex stereotypes and leaders' behaviors as measured by the agreement scale for leadership behavior. Psychological Reports, 48, 960-962.

Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S.R., Broverman, D.M., Clarksen, F.E., and Rosenkrantz, P.S. "Sex Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal," Journal of Social Issues, 28, (1972), 59-78.

Camden, C. and Witt, J. (1983). Manager communicative style and productivity: A study of female and male managers. International Journal of Women's Studies, 6:3, 258-269.

Case, S.S. (1986). A sociolinguistic analysis of the language of gender relations, deviance, and influence in managerial groups. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 07-A.

Cash, T.F. and Kilcullen, R.N. (1985). The aye of the beholder: Susceptibility to sexism and beautyism in the evaluation of managerial applicants. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15:7, 591-605.

Chapman, J.B. (1975). Comparison of male and female leadership styles. Academy of Management Journal, 18, 645-650.

Crosby, F. and Nyquist, L. (1977). The female register: An empirical study of Lohoff's Hypothesis. Language in Society, 6, 313-322.

Day, D.R. and Stogdill, R.M. (1972). Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 25, 353-360.

Deaux, K. and Taynor, J. "Evaluation of Male and Female Ability: Bias Works Two Ways," Psychological Reports, 32, (1973), 262-262.

Dipboye, R., Arvey, R., and Terpstra, D. (1977). Sex and physical attractiveness of raters and applicants as determinants of resume evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 288-294.

Donnell, S., and Hall, J. (1980). Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant difference. Organizational Dynamics, 8:4, 60-77.

Eakins, B.W. and Eakins, R.G. (1978). Sex Differences in Human Communication. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

"Employed Civilians by Occupation, Sex, and Age", (1987). Employment and Earnings U.S. Department of Labor. Table A, 22, 35.

Employment and Training Report of the President. (1982). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Erickson, B., Lind, E.A., Johnson, B.C., and O'Barr, W.M. (1978). Speech style and impression formation in court settings: The effect of 'powerful' and 'powerless' speech. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14, 266-279.

Fishman, P. (1978). Interaction: The work women do. Social Problems, 25, 397-406.

Frances, S.J. (1979). Sex differences in nonverbal behavior. Sex Roels, 5.

Garland, H., Hale, K., and Burnson, M. "Attributions for the Success and Failure of Female Managers: A Replication and Extension," Psychology of Women Quarterly, 7:2, (Winter, 1982), 155-162.

Haas, A. (1979). Male and female spoken language differences: Stereotypes and evidence. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 616-626.

Haccoun, D., Sallay, G., and Haccoun, R. (1978). Sex differences in the appropriateness of supervisory styles: A nonmanagement view. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 124-127.

Harragan, B.L. (1977). Games Mother Never Taught You. New York: Rawson Assoc. Publications.

Heilman, M.E. (1984). Information as a deterrent against sex discrimination: The effects of applicant sex and information type on preliminary employment decisions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 33, 174-186.

Hennig, M. and Jardim, A. (1977). The Managerial Woman. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Henley, N. (1977). Body Politics: Poer, Sex and Nonverbal Communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hyman, B. (1980). Responsive leadership: The woman manager's asset or liability? Supervisory Management, 25, 40-43.

Inderlied, S.D. and Powell G. (1979). Sex-Role identity and leadership style: Different labels for the same concept? Sex Roles, 5:5, 613-625.

Insko, C. and Schopler, J. (1972). Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press.

Jacobsen, M.B. and Effertz, J. (1974). Sex roles and leadership: Perceptions of the leaders and the led. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12, 383-396.

Jago, A.G. and Vroom, V.H. "Sex Differences in the Incidence and Evaluation of Participative Leadership Behavior," Journal of Applied Psychology, 67:6, (1982), 777-783.

Kramerae, C. (1981). Women and Men Speaking. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

LaFrance, M. and Mayo, C. A review of nonverbal behaviors of women and men. (1979) Western Journal of Speech Communication, 43:2, 96-107.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and Woman's Place. New York, New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Markel, N., Prebor, L., and Brandt, J. (1972). Biosocial factors in dyadic communication: Sex and speaking intensity, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 11-13.

McDonald, B.F. (1986). Male and female communicator style differences: A meta analysis. Paper presented at the Ninth Annual Conference of the Organization for the Study of Communication, Language, and Gender. Fairfax, VA.

McMillan, J.R., Clifton, A.K., McGrath, D., and Gal, W.S. (1977). Women's language: Uncertainty or interpersonal sensitivity and emotionability? Sex Roles, 3, 545-559.

Montgomery, B.M. and Norton, R.W. (1981). Sex differences and similarities in communicator style. Communication Monographs, 48, 121-132.

Moore, L.M. and Rickel, A.U. (1980). Characteristics on women in traditional and nontraditional managerial roles. Personnel Psychology, 33, 317-333.

Newcombe, N. and Arnkoff, D.B. (1979). Effects of speech style and sex of speaker on person perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1293-1303.

Nieva, V.F. and Gutek, B.A. "Sex Effects on Evaluation," Academy of Management Review, 5 (1980), 267-276.

O'Barr, W.M. (1982). Linguistic Evidence: Language, Power, and Strategy in the Courtroom. New York: Academic Press.

O'Barr, W.M. and Atkins, B.K. (1980). Women's language or powerless language? Women and Language in Literature and Society. 93-110.

Olney, C.A. (1986). The effects of managers' gender, nonverbal communication style, and respondent gender on managers' interpersonal attractiveness. Paper presented at the 72nd Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Osborn, R.N. and Vicars, W.M. "Sex Stereotypes: An Artifact in Leader Behavior and Subordinate Satisfaction Analysis?" Academy of Management Journal, 19 (1976), 439-444.

Pearson, J. (1985). Gender and Communication. William C. Brown Publishers, Dubuque, Iowa.

Petty, M.M. and Bruning, N.S. "A Comparison of the RElationships Between Subordinates' Perception of Supervisory Behavior and Measures of Subordinates' Job Satisfaction for Male and Female Leaders," Academy of Management Journal, 23:4 (1980), 717-725.

Petty, M. and Miles, R. (1976). Leader sex-role stereotyping in a female-dominated work culture. Personnel Psychology, 29, 393-404

WKU—Printing paid from state funds. KRS 57.375

Powell, G.N. (1982). Sex-role identity and sex: An important distinction for research on women in management. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 3:1, 67-69.

Powell, G.N., and Butterfield, D.A. (1984). If 'good managers' are masculine, what are 'bad managers'? Sex Roles, 10, 477-484.

Powell, G.N. and Butterfield, D.A. (1979). The 'good manager': masculine or androgynous? Academy of Management Journal, 22:2, 395-403.

Price, G. and Graves R. (1980). Sex differences in syntax and usage in oral and written language. Research in the Teaching of English, 145, 147-153.

Remland, M., Jacobson, C., and Jones, T. "Effects of Psychological Gender and Sex-Incongruent Behavior on Evaluations of Leadership," Perceptual and motor Skills, 57 (1983), 783-789.

Rosen, B. and Jerdee, T. (1974a). Effects of applicants' sex and difficulty of job on evaluation of candidates for managerial positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 511.

Rosen, B., and Jerdee, T. "Influence of Sex Role Stereotypes on Personnel Decision," Journal of Applied Psychology, 59 (1974b), 9-14.

Rosen, B. and Jerdee, T.H. "Sex Stereotyping in the Executive Suite," Harvard Business Review, 52 (1974c), 45-58.

Rosen, B. and Jerdee, T.H. (1978). Perceived sex differences in managerially relevant characteristics. Sex Roles, 4, 6.

Rosen, B. and Jerdee, T.H. (1973). The influence of sex-role stereotypes and evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 44-48.

Schein, V.E. (1975). The influence of sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 340-344.

Schein, V.E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisit management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57:2, 95-100.

Sculnick, M. "Sex Segregation in the Work Place," Employment Relations Today, 13, (Spring, 1986), 3-10.

Siegler, D.M. and Siegler, R.S. (1976). Stereotypes of males' and females speech. Psychological Reports, 39, 167-170.

Son, L. and Schmitt, N. "The Influence of Sex Bias Upon Compliance With Expert Power," Ses Rols, 9:2 (1983), 233-246.

Steinberg, R. and Shapiro, S. (1982). Sex differences in personality traits of female and male master of business administration students. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 306-310.

Terborg, J.R. "Women in Management: A Research Review," Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, (1977), 647-664.

Terborg, J.R., and Shingledecker, P. (1983). Employee reactions to supervision and work evaluation as a function of subordinate and manager sex. Sex Roles, 9, 813-824.

Thorne, B. and Henley, N. Language And Sex: Differences and Dominance. Newbury House Publishers, Inc. Rowley, Mass., 1975.

Thorne, V.E. (1975). Sex and language difference and dominance. Language in Society, 6, 110-113.

Tsue, A.A. and Gutek, B.A. "A Role Set Analysis of Gender Differences in Performance, Affective Relationships, and Career Success of Industrial Middle Managers," Academy of Management Journal, 27 (1984), 629-635.

Warfel, K.A. (1984). Gender schemes and perceptions of speech style. Communication Monographs, 51, 253-267.

Wexley, K.N. and Pulakos, E.D. [2]Sex Effects on Performance Ratings in Manager-Subordinate Syads: A Field Study," Journal of Applied Psychology, 67 (1982), 433-439.

Wheeless, V.E. and Barryman-Fink, C. (1985). Perceptions of women managers and their communicator competencies. Communication Quarterly, 33:2, 137-148.

Wiley, M.G. and Eskilon, A. (1983). Gender expectations: Slipping rungs on the corporate ladder. Sociological Focus, 16:2, 99-106.

Wiley, M.G. and Eskilson, A. (1985). Speech styles, gender stereotypes, and corporate success: What is women talk more like men? Sex Roles, 12:9/10, 993-1007.

Wright, J.W. and Hosman, L.A. (1983). Language style and sex bias in the courtroom: The effects of male and female use of hedges and intensifiers in impression formation. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 48, 137-152.

Zeldin, A., Small, S., and Savin-Williams, R. (1982). Prosocial interactions in mixed sex adolescent groups. Child Development, 53, 1492-1498.

WKU—Printing paid from state funds. KRS 57.375